

**REMARKS**

Receipt of the Office Action of October 7, 2005 is gratefully acknowledged.

Applicant provisionally elects claims 14-21, 24-55 and 59-66 with traverse.

The examiner has requested an election between claims 14-21, 24-55 and 59-66; claims 22, 23 and 67-71; claims 56-58; and claims 72-82. The basis for this election is the difference in subclassification, that is all groupings are classified in class 342, but in different subclasses.

It is respectfully submitted that the differences in subclassification cannot form the basis for an election. In fact, classification does not, in itself, establish that the invention defined in different claims are different as required by 35 U.S.C. 121. There is no mention in 35 U.S.C. 121 of differences in classification.

The examiner is urged to reconsider this requirement and examine all the pending claims.

Claims 56, 72 and 78 have been amended to further prosecution.

Reconsideration is requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Felix J. D'Ambrosio  
Reg. No. 25,721

Date: January 9, 2006

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC  
625 Slaters Lane, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Alexandria, VA 22314 - 1176  
(703) 683-0500

S:\Producer\fld\CLIENTS\Endress+Hauser Holding GmbH\SPAN3001C\Jan 9 2005 Response.wpd